REMARKS

Claims 8-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Independent claim 8 has been amended to delete the negative limitation and lifting of this basis of rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was rejected as being indefinite. Claim 10 has been canceled herein and this issue is moot.

Claims 8-12 and 18-20 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Birke* in view of *Reinhardt* and *Tsumadori*.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite the composition of the solvent which is disclosed on page 3, lines 9-11 of the specification. *Birke* discloses solvents which have less water and are primarily methanol (in most examples). None of the examples disclose propylene glycol. The propylene glycol is very important for the present application because it does not evaporate and greatly enhances the ability of the tack/wipe cloth to pick up and retain dirt and very small particulate matter. *Reinhardt* does not suggest or disclose the presence of propylene glycol in the ingredients. *Tsumadori* is not a comparable reference for impregnation of a wipe/tack cloth but is directed to the synthesis of a softener.

Amended claim 8 further recites that the substitute is a knitted fabric made from a synthetic filament as distinguished from *Reinhardt* which discloses needled or punched floor covering fabric.

Amended claim 8 recites curing the impregnated substrate by passing the substrate through an oven at 40 feet/minute and at a temperature between 280°F and 350°F. Contrary thereto, *Birke* teaches the ignition of the flammable solvent to completely burn off the solvent (column 2, lines 12-15). The burning off process is identified for each of the examples noted in the Office Action (column 7, line 1 – column 13, line 3). The present application utilizes an oven at a controlled temperature avoiding ignition of the substrate, and providing quality control of the product. The applicant uses an oven, not a furnace.

Reinhardt (column 2, lines 16-38) teaches a two-stage drying process. The fabric is fed over a series of calendars for calendaring both sides of the fabric. The calenders are heated to approximately 200°F. The fabric is then fed through a festoon dryer for approximately two hours at a temperature of approximately 220°F-240°F. This is contrasted to the present invention which is a one-stage process at higher temperatures (280°F-350°F) which occurs over a period of approximately one minute or less.

Thus, it is submitted that the combination of the cited references do not suggest or disclose the steps and the components recited in amended claim 8 and dependent claim 13.

It appears that all matters have been addressed satisfactorily, and that the case is now in condition for a complete allowance; and the same is respectfully urged.

However, if the Examiner has any comments or questions, or has any suggestions as per MPEP 707.07 (d) and (j), for putting the case in condition for final allowance, he is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned attorney-of-record at the telephone number below, so that an expeditious resolution may be effected and the case passed to issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

Dec 3, 2008
Date

Robert M. Gamson
Reg. No. 32,986
Attorney for Applicant

HODES, PESSIN & KATZ, P.A.
Department of Intellectual Property
901 Dulaney Valley Road, Suite 400
Towson, MD 21204
Phone: 410-769-6145
Fax: 410-832-5637
E-Mail: rgamson@hpklegal.com

RMG/chb
G:\files\GAMSON\ACE-TEX ENTERPRISES, INC\025127.001\PTO amendment 2.docx